REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the Final Rejection of 17 DEC. 2007 and request reconsideration of the claims as amended.

CLAIM REJECTION-SECTION 102

Claims 1-4, 7, 12, and 14 were rejected as anticipated by ${\tt HSIEH.}$

HSIEH (USP 6,193,567) discloses an electrical structure in which, as FIG. 2 shows, only a solder connection 58 is provided on the upper face of circuit board 56. In case of mechanical loading, the solder connection could readily be ripped away. The location of the insertion opening 38 is completely different from the present invention, and therefore leads in a different direction from the present invention.

CLAIM REJECTIONS-SECTION 103

On page 4 of the Action, claims 5, 6, 8 & 9 were rejected as obvious over a combination of BENDER with ${\tt HSIEH}$.

BENDER/MANNESMANN (USP 7,124,501) is directed to cable contacting via a contact tab 4 using a latching means 8. An electrical connection using soldering is not provided. This is a purely mechanical contacting system which lacks relevance to the present invention. It is directed to a simple plug-in connection and NO connection to a circuit board is taught or suggested. Since there is little or nothing to motivate an attempt to combine the HSIEH and BENDER structures, the rejection of claims 5, 6, 8 and 9 must be reconsidered and withdrawn.

On page 5 of the Action, claim 15 was rejected as obvious over a combination of HSIEH and KAWAGUCHI.

KAWAGUCHI/AMP (USP 4,790,764) discloses a structure in which mounting pins 14 engage in holes 30 in circuit board 50 by pressfits. There is no solder applied. Rather, this is purely mechanical contacting, which is dependent for its success on precisely maintaining manufacturing tolerances, and is easily dislodged under the influence of external forces. Therefore, KAWAGUCHI teaches away from the present invention, and fails to suggest or make obvious the subject-matter of the present claims. Further, the cancellation of dependent claim 15 makes this rejection moot.

On page 5, last paragraph, of the Action, claim 1 was rejected as obvious over a combination of HSIEH with NELSON.

NELSON/TURO (USP 6,702,595) discloses a fuse clip for mounting on circuit boards. As shown in NELSON FIG. 2E, the feet 36, 39 are only soldered to the underside of board 50; see col. 1, line 34. In other words, soldering, with a metallic layer inside the hole and with the foot, is not provided. The result is impaired mechanical attachment and reduced service lifetime. NELSON fails to teach or suggest the kind of redirecting-and-bending-during-insertion taught by the present invention, so no combination of HSIEH with NELSON would result in the structure recited in claim 1, as amended.

NELSON is directed to mounting of fuses 10, which during operation are rarely subjected to any mechanical loading, and thus has a different purpose and structure from the present invention.

On page 7 of the Action, claims 10-11 were rejected as obvious over a four-way combination of HSIEH, NELSON, ORIHARA and CHEN.

ORIHARA/JST MFG. (USP 6,551,149) discloses a purely electrical connection of an inserted flat conductor. FIG. 3 and col. 8, lines 9-35, teach that terminal 10 has its underside soldered by solder 26 to circuit board 30, so that this connection is vulnerable to breakage arising from mechanical vibration which would not be tolerable in many environments, such as in a motor vehicle. This disclosure teaches diametrically away from the present invention.

CHEN/RESEARCH IN MOTION (USP 6,942,500) is directed to use of C-shaped mounting clips on a circuit board 100, to grip an antenna cable. These clips are soldered onto the board. They don't function for electrical contact with the cable but merely hold the cable in a defined position, i.e. breakage of a clip would not necessarily interfere with normal electrical operation of the circuit. Thus, CHEN fails to add anything to the HSIEH-NELSON-ORIHARA combination or to suggest the feature of the present claims 1-14, as amended.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, and its dependent claims 2 through 14, are now clear, and patentably distinguish over HSIEH, NELSON, BENDER, KAWAGUCHI, ORIHARA, CHEN, and the other art of record, taken singly or in combination. All of the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner notes any remaining informalities, a telephone call to counsel is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Milton M. Oliver/

Milton Oliver, Reg. No. 28,333
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON, LLP
PO BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

TEL: 203-261-1234 FAX: 203-261-5676

EMAIL: miltonoliver@ieee.org

Att. Docket No. 870-003-216

8703-216.AM2